

**PLANNING COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD
SAFFRON WALDEN at 2pm on 8 APRIL 2015**

Present:: Councillor J Cheetham (Chairman)
Councillors C Cant, J Davey, K Eden, R Eastham, E Hicks, M
Lemon, J Loughlin, K Mackman, J Menell, D Perry, V Ranger J
Salmon and L Wells.

Officers in attendance: N Brown (Development Manager), M Cox
(Democratic Services Officer), S Marshall (Planning Officer),
Maria Tourvas (Development Manager Team Leader), C Oliva
(Solicitor), A Taylor (Assistant Director Planning and Building
Control), C Theobald (Planning Officer) and L Trevillian (Senior
Planning Officer).

PC68 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no apologies or declaration of interests

PC69 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2015 were signed by the
Chairman as a correct record subject to amendment to minute PC70 to state
that Peter Ascott and Ted Denyer spoke against the application.

PC70 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

(a) Approvals

RESOLVED that the following applications be approved subject to the
conditions set out in the officer's report

UTT/14/3763/FUL Saffron Walden - Application to vary condition 5
(restricting to sale of DIY goods of planning approval UTT/1574/87 Erection
of DIY centre including mezzanine offices car parking associated works and
alteration of an existing access) to add the following sentence:
'Notwithstanding the above, the sale and display of any A1 non-food goods
by Catalogue Showroom Retailer will be permitted from up to 185 square
metres of existing sales area - Elizabeth Way for Homebase Limited.

(b) Approvals with legal obligation

UTT/14/3770/FUL Little Canfield – removal of condition 8 from planning
permission UTT/14/1819/FUL for the demolition of existing buildings and
erection of 13 dwellings – Stansted Motel & 2 Hamilton Road, Little Canfield
for Bushmead Homes Ltd.

RESOLVED that conditional approval be granted for the above application subject

1 to the conditions in the report and an additional condition to provide access gates within the railings to the front of the named properties fronting Hamilton Road and Thornton Road.

2 a legal obligation as follows

- . (I) The applicant be informed that the committee would be minded to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph (III) unless the freeholder owner enters into a binding obligation to cover the matters set out below under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, in a form to be prepared by the Assistant Chief Executive – Legal, in which case he shall be authorised to conclude such an obligation to secure the following:
 - (i) Secure contributions towards education
 - (ii) Pay Council reasonable legal costs
 - (iii) Pay monitoring costs
- (II) In the event of such an obligation being made, the Assistant Director Planning and Building Control shall be authorised to grant permission subject to the conditions set out below
- (III) If the freehold owner shall fail to enter into such an obligation by 30 April 2015 by the Assistant Director of Planning and Building Control shall be authorised to refuse permission in his discretion anytime thereafter for the following reasons:
 - (i) Lack of contributions towards education

(c) Site visits

UTT/14/3819/FUL Chrishall – erection of 5 proposed dwellings with garages, home offices and access roadway – Hillside Farm for Mr and Mrs Smart for Pelham Structures Ltd

Reason: to assess the impact of the development in the location.

Tom Jackson (parish Council) spoke against the application. Bill Bampton spoke in support of the application.

UTT/15/0404/FUL Great Canfield – proposed change of use of land for two additional pitches at existing gypsy caravan site – Tandans, Great Canfield Road for Mr and Mrs Boswell

Reason: to assess the impact on the local area.

James Kellerman, Robert Mackley (parish council) spoke against the application. Mr Perrin spoke in support of the application.

LAND NORTH OF STANSTED ROAD ELSENHAM (UTT/14/3279/DFO)

This application had been reported to the Planning Committee on 11 March 2015 when members had resolved to refuse the application on the grounds of GEN 1 and GEN 2. The precise wording of the refusal was left unclear and Members were asked to clarify and confirm the agreed refusal reason. Officers' recollection was that the main and possible only refusal reason was based on the proximity of the proposed access to the property Hill Croft.

The wording of a refusal reason on this basis had been prepared. This only included reference to GEN 2 because GEN1 was a totally technical policy and it would be difficult to sustain a reason on these grounds when the Highway Authority raised no objection.

Since the last meeting the applicant had responded with an amended plan which proposed the relocation of the access 2.2m to the east of its previous siting. This was the greatest distance that it could be moved without compromising visibility. The parish council, the occupier and Highway Authority had been consulted. The applicant had also provided a tracking plan for refuse vehicles.

Dr Mott (resident of Hill Croft) and Peter Johnson (Elsenham Parish Council) spoke to the meeting. They said that the previous meeting had discussed issues other than access, which included the design of the 3 storey dwelling, parking courts, amenity space. Also the amended plan, although further away from Hill Croft, would be closer to other properties and there appeared to be a fundamental flaw in the design concept and access road.

Peter Biggs, the applicant said he had listened to the residents and the parish council and had amended many aspects of the scheme to take account of their comments. The location of the access position had been moved as far as was possible away from the neighbour. The scheme complied with all local plan policies.

The Chairman asked the committee to first confirm the reasons for refusal. She said Members could then go on to discuss the application if they felt that the refusal reason had been adequately addressed in the revised drawings. This would require a vote to suspend standing orders.

Councillor Mackman recalled that there were issues other than access that had been discussed at the meeting, such as design and parking. He had also put forward GEN8 but this had been removed. Councillor Eastham questioned how the decision could be unclear. He remembered supporting a change to the access but other issues were also raised. The Development Manager said the refusal reasons GEN1 and GEN2 couldn't stand on their own and officers needed to frame a detailed refusal around these, and this was the area that was still unclear.

Councillor Eden suggested that members could listen to the meeting recording to clarify what had been said. It was agreed that a transcript of the meeting would be more useful.

RESOLVED to defer the item to the next meeting in order for Members to receive a transcript of the meeting.

PC72 TREE AT SAFFRON WALDEN CASTLE MUSEUM STREET

The committee considered a proposal to remove branches from a sycamore tree within a conservation area at Saffron Walden Castle as the leaves and debris from the overhanging branches were having a detrimental effect on the fabric of the flint a rubble wall. The works were considered to be acceptable and it was

RESOLVED that no objection be raised to the proposed removal of branches.

PC73 WORKS TO A TREE WITHIN A CONSERVATION AREA

The committee considered a request for the re-pollarding of a sycamore tree within a conservation area at 23 Westfields, Saffron Walden. The proposal was considered to be acceptable and it was

RESOLVED that no objection be raised to the proposed pollarding of the tree.

PC74 APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted the appeals that had been received since the last meeting.

PC75 PLANNING AGREEMENTS

The Committee received the list of the outstanding S106 agreements.

The meeting ended at 4.30pm.